

The I. B. Horner Lecture 1995 Lexicography, Pali, and Pali lexicography

My official title at Cambridge includes the words Pali Lexicography — a rather general and abstract way to refer to what I am engaged in, which is something much more specific: the writing of a new Pali-English Dictionary for the Pali Text Society. I should like to speak about that dictionary, about what it will be like, what it will aim to do, how it is being written. But I shall speak also about the business of dictionary-writing, and about the history of Pali lexicography in particular.

I would like to begin with a quotation, from a preface — prefaces and quotations, which are part of the stuff of dictionary writing, will feature fairly prominently in my remarks tonight. So, from a preface:

It is the fate of those who toil at the lower employments of life, to be rather driven by the fear of evil than attracted by the prospect of good; to be exposed to censure, without hope of praise; to be disgraced by miscarriage, or punished for neglect, where success would have been without applause, and diligence without reward. Among these unhappy mortals is the writer of dictionaries; whom mankind have considered, not as the pupil, but the slave of science, the pioneer of literature, doomed only to remove rubbish and clear obstructions from the paths of learning and Genius, who press forward to conquest and glory, without bestowing a smile on the humble drudge that facilitates their progress. Every other author may aspire to praise; the lexicographer can

only hope to escape reproach, and even this negative recompense has been yet granted to very few.

That is the opening of Dr. Johnson's Preface to his Dictionary. I hope you can enjoy the power of his rhetoric and language. I fear that, unless you have ever been a dictionary-writer, you will not appreciate the truth of what he says. Lexicographers inhabit a closed and secret region, unvisited, unknown to others. I have more in common, more fellow-feeling, with other writers of dictionaries than with those who seem nearer to me, such as the denizens of Oriental Faculties, or indeed other Pali scholars, and I shall frequently use the words of three lexicographers, Johnson, Monier-Williams and Stede, to express my own feelings.

If you read the prefaces to dictionaries — although you probably won't: they are usually read only by other lexicographers — but if you were to read the prefaces, you would often find, not the sober statement of the aims of the dictionary, its format, and how best to use it, that you might expect, but a passionate apologia, a piteous cry about the difficulties, the despairs, the unlooked-for but unavoidable delays, the dastardly or dull-witted acts of others — a preface which in rugby parlance is getting its retaliation in first. One aspect of my talk is a kind of preface to the Pali-English Dictionary on which I work, and if you think you hear a note of defensive self-justification, you are probably right.

I have said there will be quotations and prefaces. Another theme will be of evolution and relationship. I am associated with Darwin College, Cambridge, and a Darwinian slant seems appropriate. Lexicography indeed illustrates Natural Selection, or perhaps better the Survival of the Fittest — rather literally, as the work seems to take a heavy toll. Who can forget Dr. Schönberg, described by Monier-Williams in the introduction to his Sanskrit Dictionary?

[He] came to the work in a condition of great physical weakness, and [his] assistance only extended from May 1884 to July 1885, when he left me to die;

or indeed Prof. Goldstücker, commemorated in the same introduction, who

... was singularly unpractical in some of his ideas ... he finished the printing of 480 pages of his own work, which only brought him to the word *arimḍama* ... when an untimely death cut short his lexicographical labours;

but you may not know of Herbert Coleridge, first editor of the New English Dictionary (later the Oxford English Dictionary) who

died in 1861 at the early age of 31, from consumption brought on by a chill caused by sitting in damp clothes during a Philological Society lecture. When he was told that he would not recover he is reported to have exclaimed, "I must begin Sanskrit tomorrow".

His successor as editor-in-chief, Sir James Murray, died in July 1915, after 36 years' work; the last part of the Dictionary appeared in the beginning of 1928. Monier-Williams himself completed the Sanskrit Dictionary only a few days before his death, and did not see it published. And of course, Thomas William Rhys Davids, begetter of the Pali Text Society's first Pali-English Dictionary, died in 1922, three years before the final part of that dictionary was published. I do not say that lexicography is a dangerous pursuit — only that the project is often longer-lived than the writer.

And there is survival of the fittest in another way too: the good dictionary makes others redundant. As in Sanskrit grammar Pāṇini survives, so in Sanskrit lexicography Amarasiṃha remains the chief name. And he forms part of a chain or tree of development, — not a series in which the succeeding practitioners out-do their predecessors, but where each one makes use of what has gone before, using previous work for a new kind of work. With both arrogance and humility, I set myself at a present point on this line of succession, taking a place in a *paramparā* of workers in words.

Claus Vogel begins his survey of Indian Lexicography with these words:

Lexicographic work started in India at a very early date with the compilation of word-lists (*nighaṇṭu*) giving rare, unexplained, vague, or otherwise difficult terms culled from sacred writings.

Already you can see the line of descent: I spend much of my time with rare, unexplained, vague or otherwise difficult terms culled from sacred writings. Of course the *Nighaṇṭu* is not like the Pali-English Dictionary, but it does set a pattern for several centuries of Indian lexicography. It begins with three sections of synonyms, the first section giving words for physical things, beginning with earth, the second words for man and qualities associated with man, the third words for abstract qualities; then follows a list of difficult words; and finally a section of the names of deities, beginning with Agni. To the user of a modern dictionary it all seems rather disorganised — the order of words often appears arbitrary, verbal forms occur beside nouns or adjectives — but if we add to it Yāska's *Nirukta*, of the early centuries BC, we have various elements which will persist. Yāska defines the obscure or difficult words, often giving an etymology or derivation, quoting the *R̥g*-vedic verse and

adding a commentary to explain or justify his definition; he considers suffixes and particles, describing their sense, their position, their use, noting differences between Vedic and Classical Sanskrit, again supporting his assertions with quotations. One recognises the method. One recognises other things too. His etymologies are usually fanciful; and already there is present a characteristic of many (perhaps all) lexicographers and commentators: often they don't know what the word means. Dr. Johnson, when asked by a lady why he defined 'pastern' — wrongly — as the knee of a horse, replied 'Ignorance, madam, pure ignorance'. Look for example at *Nirukta* 2:7 foll. where Yāska gives two meanings for the word *nirṛti*, neither of which is that given to it in the *Nighaṇṭu*. And the *Nighaṇṭu* and Yāska are like the Pali-English Dictionary in this, that their concern is with a limited and fairly homogeneous body of texts; their function is as a teaching aid in the interpretation of scripture; the definitions and explanations must make sense within the world-view of that scripture, not merely in some abstract and general linguistic sphere.

We have similar material in the Pali Canon itself, although we don't have any lists of words without contexts. But in the *Vinaya Piṭaka* the important words in a rule are explained or defined. This is definition with a specific and limited purpose: to make clear precisely what the *sikkhāpada* refers to, so that there is no doubt about what is an *āpatti* and what not. It is not quite definition in the way we would expect in a dictionary. See *Vin* III 23,37 foll.: the rule begins *yo pana bhikkhu ...* and the old commentary has

*yo panā ti yo yādiso yathāyutto yathājacco yathānāmo
yathāgotto yathāsīlo yathāvihārī yathāgocaro thero vā
navo vā majjhimo vā eso vuccati yo panā ti. bhikkhū ti
bhikkhako ti bhikkhu, bhikkhācariyaṃ ajjhūpagato ti,*

bhinnapaṭadharo ti bhikkhu ... ehi bhikkhū ti bhikkhu
...

In this case, various explanations are given, and one is chosen as most appropriate for this particular context. Or see Vin III 189,11:

upāsikā nāma buddhaṃ saraṇaṃ gatā dhammaṃ
saraṇaṃ gatā saṅghaṃ saraṇaṃ gatā.

Sometimes the old commentary is closer to that method of synonyms we are familiar with, eg Vin III 46,35:

ādiyeyyā ti ādiyeyya hareyya avahareyya iriyāpathaṃ
vikopeyya thānā cāveyya saṅketaṃ vītināmeyya.

And already there are grammatical explanations, eg Vin III 73,33:

ambho purisā ti ālapanavacanaṃ etaṃ.

The real lexicographical text is the Niddesa, which deals with each word of the Aṭṭhaka and Pārāyaṇa vaggas of the Sutta Nipāta in a way which supplies the place of a dictionary. Practically every word is clarified, either by synonyms, or by what is really a doctrinal exegesis, or by a statement of the word's grammatical form and function. Let us look merely at the first verse of the Kāmasutta:

kāmaṃ kāmayamānassa tassa ce taṃ samijjhati
addhā pītimano hoti laddhā macco yad icchati

The Niddesa tells us there are two types of *kāma* — *vatthukāmā* and *kīlesakāmā*. It then explains the two types, giving many examples. Synonyms are given for *kāmayamānassa*, *samijjhati*, *pītimano*, *macco*

and *icchati*. *tassa* is explained as any sort of man or god. *addhā* is defined as an expression for certainty: *ekamsavacanaṃ nissamsayavacanaṃ* etc. *pītimano* is split into *pīti* and *mano*, and synonyms given. For *laddhā* the more familiar form *labhītvā* is given, with more near synonyms. And this is the pattern throughout the Niddesa. It is rather wasteful, as when a word recurs, the same explanation is given in full. But this is of course a text to be memorised. Every repetition both relaxes the effort and reinforces the message.

A comparable practice is followed in the Peṭakopadesa and Nettipakaraṇa, especially in the *vevacana* sections. And in all these texts, the Vinaya, the Niddesa, Peṭakopadesa and Netti, we recognise a primary aim, similar to that we saw in the Nighaṇṭu and Nirukta, first to clarify the words of the Buddha, to specify their acceptation, and then to place those words within the overall teaching, to define not merely what a particular word can mean, but what it means in that context and in the context of the *dhamma* as a whole. And this is an aim I think even an English twentieth century definer of Pali words must keep in mind. I dread being asked what I do, for every word I say requires several sentences of explanation. You may not be quite aware of the depth of *avijjā* about Pali — in the sense both of ignorance and of wrong knowledge — of those who are quite conversant with superconductivity or Pre-Raphaelite painting or even medieval theology. But at some point I say ‘Pali is the language of Theravāda Buddhist texts’, and though that statement is an attempt to make simple a complicated question, it expresses an important truth. The Nirukta, the *padabhājanīya* sections of the Vinaya, the Pali-English Dictionary, look inward; they aim to tell what a term connotes at a particular time in a particular context, not what it might or could connote in a living, developing language.

The format of word-lists is used by that other survivor in Sanskrit lexicography, Amarasimha, of about the seventh or eighth

century of our era, but in his work, *Nāmaṅgānuśāsana*, one is aware of more order. Like the *Nighaṇṭu*, he has sections of synonyms, beginning with heaven and the gods, and including appellations of the Buddha. Then there is a section of homonyms — words with more than one sense, or words of the same form but different meaning; and then a section of indeclinables. And our first Pali dictionary appears to be mainly based on *Amarasimha's* work. That is the *Abhidhānappadīpikā* by a certain *Moggallāna* who lived in the *Jetavana vihāra* in *Polonnaruwa* during the reign and under the patronage of *Parakkama Bāhu I*, in the twelfth century of our era. The format of the *Abhidhānappadīpikā* is very similar to that of the *Amarakośa*: it begins with three sections of synonyms, the first section — *saggakaṇḍa* — dealing with heaven, the gods, the quarters of space, time, mental states, virtues, vices, dancing, musical instruments, objects of the senses, the *Vedas*, but beginning in this case with the appellations of a Buddha, and of our Buddha, *Gotama* (the first word is *buddho*), and including expressions for *nibbāna*. It sounds rather chaotic, but in fact there is a sort of logical progression of ideas, enough to help those who had to memorise it, who were also helped by its being in verse, mainly in *śloka*s. The second section, *bhūkaṇḍa*, deals with earth and countries, with towns and buildings; with men and women, their bodies, their ornaments, their diseases and disabilities, with their class and occupations; with forests and trees and plants, with mountains, with animals, birds and insects; with rivers and seas and lotuses; then we have adjectives, and other nouns which have not already been covered. *Moggallāna* provides a considerable amount of information: synonyms are given in the nominative case, and where the gender of a word is not clear from its form, the gender is specified, eg by *tthī* or *tthiyaṃ* for a feminine, *napuṃsa* for a neuter, *nitthiyaṃ* if the word can be masculine or neuter. Not all is consistent — remember, it is difficult to write any kind of dictionary, especially in verse. It is not always clear where a subject changes; and there are words to fill a line which can be confusing. Most entries are lists of synonyms, but

sometimes they merely list associated words, for example, after names for *Indra* we are given the name of *Indra's* wife, of his elephant, of his chariot etc. And some entries list types of things, eg 147 lists types of perfumes, 148 lists the six categories of tastes.

Moggallāna's next section, like *Amarasimha's*, is of homonyms. Here the head-word is in the nominative, and the meanings in the locative, sometimes compounded. If the word in different senses differs in gender, then the head-word is repeated with the appropriate termination. The head-word is not always given first, but because it is the only nominative, there is no confusion. And as with the synonyms, gender is marked where there could be ambiguity or misunderstanding, eg 808:

so bandhave 'tani ca saṃ so dhanasmiṃ anitthiyaṃ
sā pume sunakhe vutto 'taniye so tilingiko.

The words are given in descending order of the number of senses, or perhaps, better, according to the length of the verse. The first word — *samaya*, v 778 — has nine meanings in two *anuṣṭubh* lines; but *dāna*, v 1014, has six meanings in one line. Otherwise, there is no obvious method to the ordering of words. Occasionally a word is defined by itself, but only in the Sinhalese edition, not in the Burmese. As often, we wonder: does the Burmese reading give us the original text, or did some Burmese editor recognise the unsatisfactoriness, and 'emend'?

The final section of the *Abhidhānappadīpikā* deals with indeclinables — particles, prefixes, adverbs. I am disappointed not to find among the words for 'where?' the form *ko* (Sanskrit *kva*), which is recognised by *Buddhaghosa* and by *Aggavaṃsa* in the *Saddanīti* (although *Moggallāna* does give *kva* itself).

Moggallāna's Abhidhānappadīpikā is based on Amarasimha's work, and perhaps other Sanskrit *kośas*, and he gives Pali words which have not — not yet at any rate — been found in any Pali text, and we might suspect these words are merely Sanskrit words Pali-ised. It may be, rather, that comparatively late texts in Pali, not sufficiently studied by lexicographers, make use of such words, and are Moggallāna's source and justification. For Moggallāna does not slavishly follow Amarasimha — he is compiling a *kośa* for Pali Buddhist texts, with specifically Buddhist words and ideas. For example, as well as that entry including *nibbāna*:

*mokkho nirodho nibbānaṃ dīpo taṇhakkhayo paraṃ
tānaṃ lenaṃ arūpaṃ ca santaṃ saccaṃ anālayaṃ ...*

there are canonical references such as 157, listing the fourfold *virīya*.

The Abhidhānappadīpikā is by no means merely an historical curiosity or indeed merely a guide to 12th century Pali. I think we can assume it reflects a long tradition of understanding and, like Aggavaṃsa's Saddanīti, is the product of someone with a wide knowledge of the texts. Both Moggallāna and Aggavaṃsa give explanations of difficult or obscure words or passages, which we should take seriously. Often, when they seem to us to make statements contrary to our Sanskrit-trained analysis, or to assign a sense to a word for which we see no etymological justification, they are dealing with a specific case in the texts which they need to interpret in conformity with its Buddhist context, and they may be right in what they say. For example, the Pali-English Dictionary explains *tathāgata* only as an epithet of an *arhat* (it does not actually *define* the word). Abh 93 lists *tathāgata* among words meaning a living being, and 1099 states: *tathāgato jine satte*. However we explain or derive *tathāgata*, there are passages where it cannot refer

only to the Buddha, and we must accept Moggallāna's testimony — that is what he and the tradition understood, and it makes sense.

Accepting all that, nevertheless Moggallāna is beginning with a Sanskrit model, adapting it to Pali, and adding or changing where the Canon does not fit the model, and this cannot be ultimately satisfactory. A Pali lexicographer now should make use of the Abhidhānappadīpikā and its testimony, but should begin with Pali and the texts, trying to explain what is actually there. As so often, we must find a Middle Way, between the extremes of seeing the Pali Canon as an hermetically sealed, self-sufficient corpus, best explained by itself, without historical or linguistic context, or as a totally dependent system, which, to put it crudely, exhibits a rather perverse misunderstanding of other systems of thought and analysis. Like Moggallāna and Aggavaṃsa we must deal with and interpret what is before us, not what might have been; but we are free of some of their limitations and constraints.

The Nighaṇṭu and Yāska, Amarasimha, the Vinaya, Niddesa and Moggallāna — a long connected tradition leads to an Englishman, Robert Caesar Childers, born in 1838, the son of the English chaplain at Nice. In the early 1860s he was in Śrī Laṅkā, first as a writer in the Ceylon Civil Service, then for three years as private secretary to the Governor, Sir Charles McCarthy. He is said to have taken great pains to understand the Sinhalese, studying their language and literature and religion, even, *mirabile dictu*, giving up one of his vacations to study Pali under Yātrāmullē Terunnāṇse. He himself, however, said that his effort to learn Pali under a native pandit met with indifferent success. In March 1864 his health broke down, and he returned to England, where, after studying with Rost, in 1869 he published in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society the Pali text of the Khuddakapāṭha with a translation and notes. This was the first Pali text printed in England. He then devoted the greater part of his time for the rest of his life to a Pali Dictionary. The

first volume of that dictionary was published in 1872, the second volume in 1875, by which time he was Professor of Pali and Buddhist Literature at University College London.

If one reads Childers' preface to his Dictionary, three things, I think, strike one. The first is the absolute confidence of his assertions about Pali and Pali Buddhism, probably none of which we would now accept without reservation. Here is a thought on Pali:

... the softening or breaking up of groups of consonants, the dropping of final consonants, the absence of rigid rules of sandhi, the absence of sounds like *r*, *ṣ* and *au* — all this gives to Pali a softness and flexibility for which we may gladly exchange the stately but harsh regularity of Sanskrit.

I shouldn't imagine I'm alone among students of Pali in not rarely sighing for the regularity of Sanskrit. And on Pali Buddhism:

... the North Buddhist books have no claim to originality, but are partly translations or adaptations of the Pali sacred books, made several centuries after Gotama's time, and partly late outgrowths of Buddhism exhibiting that religion in an extraordinary state of corruption and travesty.

This is hardly politically correct. But this vehemence springs, I feel, from the second striking thing, a very sympathetic trait: his great enthusiasm for Pali and Pali Buddhism. For example, he says:

If the proud boast that the Magadhese [as he considers Pali to be] is the one primeval language fades in the

light of comparative philology, Buddhists may console themselves with the thought that the teaching of Gotama confers upon it a greater lustre than it can derive from any fancied antiquity.

And he compares Pali and the Canon with Dante's Tuscan Italian and the Divine Comedy. The third thing is the very small number of texts to which he apparently had access, or at any rate lists as 'Authorities Quoted': Minayeff's *Prātimokṣasūtra*; his own *Khuddakapāṭha*; Fausbøll's *Dhammapada* of 1855; the same scholar's *Five Jātakas* and *Ten Jātakas*; six suttas of the *Dīgha Nikāya*, with the commentary to three of them, all in manuscript; Turnour's *Mahāvamsa*; and Trenckner's edition of the first chapter of the *Milindapañha*; and not much else. Except, of course, Moggallāna's *Abhidhānappadīpikā*, edited by Waskaḍuwē Subhūti, with whom Childers was in correspondence, and who supplied him with much information. I think we must also believe that Childers' studies had made him familiar with many more texts than he was able to cite.

I consider Childers' Dictionary an admirable work. It is clear and straightforward, although he gives his articles in the order of the Roman alphabet, which requires concentration on the part of the reader, I find. Compounds are given within the article. He gives a Sanskrit parallel where possible; defines the word; quotes from a text, if available, and translates the quotation. For the more difficult or doctrinal terms he gives an exposition rather than a definition. Compare, if you can, Childers' article on *dhmma*, in three columns, with PED's article (seven and a half columns). Childers begins with a list of definitions, and follows that with quotations illustrating the various senses, translating these quotations so that it is clear how he understands the word in each context. PED seems to me confused in layout and organisation, and overweighted with technical terms from psychology. Or compare the articles on

kamma. Or read his very first article, on the negative prefix *a-*, *an-*. I follow PED in describing the general use of the prefix, and giving examples only in their proper place, but Childers' article with its column of various kinds of examples is illuminating and still to be read with profit.

His article on *nibbāna* is a long essay, and, like all of his articles, is based on the texts and tradition. His evidences and sources are the texts and the practitioners, and seemingly for him, as for me, the main duty of a Pali lexicographer is to define words in a way that makes sense within the texts as we have them, not as we fancy some original meaning might have been, in some imagined original teaching.

Of course Childers' Dictionary is not perfect — how could it be at that stage of knowledge of Pali? There are words and passages he has misunderstood, or where he has followed other writers like Gogerly who had misunderstood. But it is a considerable achievement, and Childers forms an important link in the chain of Pali lexicography. I quote now from the Dictionary of National Biography:

After the completion of the Dictionary Childers with unwearied zeal looked forward to renewed activity. He had announced his intention of publishing a complete translation of the Buddhist Jātaka book ... but a cold contracted in the early part of 1876 developed into a rapid consumption, and he died on 25th July 1876 at the age of 38 ... To an unusually powerful memory and indomitable energy Childers united an enthusiasm in the cause of research, a passionate patience, rare even in new and promising fields.

I like that 'passionate patience'. The writer of that article in the DNB was Thomas William Rhys Davids. He joined the Ceylon Civil Service in 1866 — two years after Childers left — and stayed there for eight years. He also studied Pali with Yātrāmullē Terunnānsē, and, although called to the Bar in 1877, he devoted himself to the study of Pali and Pali Buddhism for the rest of his life. An improved Pali-English Dictionary was always one of his aims. In 1902 he hoped to begin to create this dictionary. As his later collaborator wrote,

It was to be compiled on the basis of the texts issued by the Pali Text Society since its foundation in 1882, and it was conceived on an international plan, according to which some seven or eight famous Sanskrit scholars of Europe should each contribute to the work. Every one of them was enthusiastic about it. In 1903 Rhys Davids announced that the Dictionary would be published in 1905, or at latest in 1906 ... by 1909 only one-eighth of the work had been done. Gradually the co-workers sent back the materials which Rhys Davids had supplied to them. Some had done nothing at all, nor even opened the packets. Only Messrs. Duroiselle and Konow and Mrs. Bode had carried out what they had undertaken to do. After Rhys Davids had again conferred with his colleagues at the Copenhagen Congress in 1908, he published the full scheme of the Dictionary in J.P.T.S. for 1909. Then the War came and stopped the plans for good.

This unreliability of co-workers is another of those themes which run through any account of dictionaries. Monier-Williams seems to have found everybody lacking. He writes:

Nay, I am constrained to confess that as I advanced further on the path of knowledge, my trustfulness in others ... experienced a series of disagreeable and unexpected shocks; till now ... I find myself left with my faith in the accuracy of human beings generally — and certainly not excepting myself — somewhat distressingly disturbed.

And I have read that the Grimm brothers, in compiling their German Dictionary, had found that out of eighty-three helpers only six were satisfactory, and only one of them ideal.

To return to Rhys Davids: in 1916, when he was already over 70 years old, he decided to launch a provisional dictionary himself, with the help of Dr. William Stede as co-editor. For years he had entered quotations and references in his interleaved copy of Childers' Dictionary, a copy bequeathed to him by Childers himself, and this material was the basis of the new dictionary.

The preface to the Pali-English Dictionary makes it clear that the editors were fully aware of the limitations of their work:

... to wait for perfection would postpone the much-needed dictionary to the Greek kalends. It has therefore been decided to proceed as rapidly as possible with the completion of this first edition, and to reserve the proceeds of the sale for the eventual issue of a second edition which shall come nearer to our ideals of what a Pali Dictionary should be.

That was written in 1921. Again we meet a common theme. Put crudely, do we get it right, or get it out? Sir James Murray was continually

pressed, at times in rather unpleasant terms, by the Delegates of the Oxford University Press to produce more quickly and less carefully. Publish now, and correct in a later edition seemed to be the message. For a Pali-English Dictionary I think the choice is less stark. Perfection is impossible, as complete knowledge of the exact sense of every Pali word is impossible. The compromise is, I think, to impose some limitation on the material, and to accept that some problems are as yet insoluble and move on, leaving a query, in order that one can publish within a reasonable time. But to try to make sure that what one does assert, is as accurate and justifiable as possible.

Rhys Davids' preface is a mild statement; the Apologia appears in Dr. Stede's Afterword. There is much which, *mutatis mutandis*, I could copy as a description of my own case. Listen, for example, to his second paragraph:

When Rhys Davids ... entrusted me with the work, he was still hopeful and optimistic about it, in spite of the failure of the first Dictionary scheme, and thought it would take only a few years to get it done. He seemed to think that the material which was at hand (and the value of which he greatly overrated) could be got ready for press with very little trouble. Alas! it was not so. For it was not merely and not principally a rearrangement and editing of ready material: it was creative and re-creative work from beginning to end, building an intellectual (so to say *manomaya*) edifice on newly-sunk foundations and fitting all the larger and smaller (*khuddakānukhuddakāni*) accessories into their places. This was not to be done in a hurry, nor in a leisurely way. It was a path which led through jungle and thicket, over stones and sticks.

The style is not mine, but I recognise the problems.

I expect that all here are familiar with the Pali-English Dictionary, and are well aware of its merits and deficiencies. It still seems to me a fairly reliable guide for one beginning to read Pali. For the majority of words, the definition is sufficiently accurate to enable one to understand the text. Some definitions are, as I think, wrong, but that is inevitable. Even had Rhys Davids and Stede had all the material now available, they were bound — as are all lexicographers — to fail to understand or to misunderstand some passages. On detail in PED I am less happy. As it is one of my sources of material I look up all its references. I have been surprised at the inaccuracy of these references, the occasions on which the same citation is given for two different senses of a word, the long lists of citations of an identical expression, without that fact being made clear in the article. One of my favourite misplacements is *sub voce accharā*², Sanskrit *apsaras*, a celestial nymph, where both citations from the Dhammapada atthakathā belong with *accharā*¹, a snap of the fingers or a pinch. Dhpa III 8,22 has the expression *accharam pahari*, which refers to snapping one's fingers as a gesture of dismissal, but could mean 'struck the apsaras'; there are apsaras in the story, but I don't think the thera struck any of them. I also find tedious the large number of unilluminating citations from the commentaries to the Petavatthu and Therīgāthā, which are very unsatisfactory editions — again, perhaps inevitable, as very few commentaries had then been published. I imagine you have learnt to be suspicious of the articles on words which are not common or obvious, and to check, not only the references given, but also Monier-Williams and Edgerton's Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary. It seems to me that Stede is sometimes perverse in his refusal to take Sanskrit as evidence for the meaning of a word. This is another subject on which we should take a Middle Way. I have already stressed that a Pali Dictionary must define in the context of the whole Canon and of Buddhist doctrine, and of course there are

words, not only technical terms, which have a meaning in Pali distinct from the Sanskrit sense — after all, that is exactly the sort of thing Edgerton's Dictionary is concerned with. But equally there are words which make perfectly good sense if identified with a Sanskrit equivalent, without the need to find some special Pali connotation.

I suppose what I don't like about PED will become clear from the ways in which my dictionary differs from it. Perhaps primarily in relation to style or tone. I find some of Stede's assertions, and the didactic tone of the longer articles, somewhat uncomfortable. I hope my tone will be more neutral, that there will be less of the lexicographer and more of the texts.

But perhaps now is the time to say a little about this lexicographer. I have learnt what I know of Pali from two Presidents of the Pali Text Society — only the best for me — first as an undergraduate from Prof. Gombrich, a great enthusiast for the Pali Canon and an inspiring teacher, and then, as a graduate student and collaborator, from Prof. Norman, an equally inspiring teacher with an awesome knowledge of words. And many years ago I wrote PTS invoices for, and drank the coffee of, that previous President whose scholarship and generosity this lecture commemorates. I feel, however, part of the *paramparā* for another reason: the texts of the Canon and the commentaries which I use belonged to Miss Horner, and came to her, some from Lord Chalmers, editor and translator, and some from the library of Prof. and Mrs. Rhys Davids. So I read the actual pages Rhys Davids read. That I account a privilege and pleasure.

I have traced a lexicographic line — a little tendentiously — from the Nighaṇṭu and the Vinaya to myself. I have not mentioned — you may have noticed — a rather important dictionary, the Critical Pali Dictionary of Copenhagen. I don't intend to speak of it at any length,

partly because I could not do it justice in the confines of this lecture, and partly because, central though it is to Pali studies, it is tangential to my theme, which is mainly of the Pali Text Society and English (or adopted English) scholars. As it were, the branch bifurcates after the *Abhidhānappadīpikā*.

The two motives for CPD were that abandoned International Dictionary scheme of Rhys Davids, and the work of Trenckner. Carl Wilhelm Trenckner (1824 - 1891), a Dane of very wide knowledge in languages, who worked for thirty years teaching Danish and elementary History and Geography in an orphanage, made transcripts of most of the Pali manuscripts in the rich Copenhagen Collection, and of others from London, and had made preparations for a dictionary, in the form of small paper-slips containing words and references, or observations on grammar and syntax, or quotations illustrating secular and daily life. In the Preface to the first fascicle of CPD in 1925 the two editors, Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith, briefly relate the history of the dictionary scheme, and the idea that the redaction of the dictionary should take place at Copenhagen where the work as it progressed could constantly be checked by means of Trenckner's material and with the manuscripts of the Rask Collection. After the war had ended hopes of international co-operation, they write:

in 1916, the present editors conceived a plan of editing the dictionary without the aid of foreign co-workers, a task which must of course be calculated to cover at least fifteen years.

Please note that 'fifteen years'. Volume I (words beginning with short *a-*) was brought to a conclusion in 1948. The Dictionary was so to speak re-launched as — and really this time — an international effort in 1958. The first fascicle of Volume II was published in 1960. CPD has

continued to appear, and has now dealt with words beginning *kan-*. After several vicissitudes, its future now looks more secure.

CPD is a giant work. I have not read anywhere a statement of its aims, but it strikes me as committed to completeness. Everything should be examined, discussed, if possible explained, or even corrected. Light should be shone in every musty corner; meanings, shades of meanings, should be hunted down and dissected. I admit I have felt in some fascicles an oppressive weight of material: citation after almost identical citation, with the worthy aim, I think, of illustrating the word from *every* type and age of text; definitions divided, almost into infinity, in a punctilious attempt to catch every nuance, pin down every metaphorical use; compound after compound, even straightforward *dvandvas*, listed, so that, I suppose, nothing should be unaccounted for. An exhaustive dictionary and, of course, for any serious Pali scholar, indispensable. The first volume, written by two men in whom a wide knowledge of Pali was combined with expertise in philology, in grammar, in Sanskrit and other Indo-Aryan languages in a way rarely seen, is meticulous, scholarly, authoritative, instructive, awe-inspiring. Not all fascicles have reached their standard, but the more recent have regained much of that authority.

I thought it might be interesting to look at examples of my three predecessors — Childers, PED and CPD — before I talk, as the final part of my lecture, of the New Pali-English Dictionary. I mentioned earlier the word *accharā*, a homonym, meaning an *apsaras* or a snap of the fingers. Here are the articles for that second meaning:

Childers: *ACCHARĀ* (f.) A moment, the snapping of a finger, the twinkling of an eye [*akṣara*]. Ab 66.

You will see that Childers' only reference is to the *Abhidhānappadīpikā*. We must assume that the word did not appear in those *Jātakas* or those

portions of the Dhammapada commentary to which he had access in Fausbøll's editions. The derivation from Sanskrit *akṣara* is presumably merely a guess from the form. Unfortunately, Childers has not found the most common acceptance of the word.

PED: **accharā**¹ (f.) [etym. uncertain, but certainly dialectical; Trenckner connects it with *ācchurita* (Notes 76); Childers compares Sk. *akṣara* (see *akkhara*); there may be a connection with *akkhaṇa* in *akkhaṇavedhin* (cp. BSk. *acchaṭā* Divy 555), or possibly a relation to *ā + tsar*, thus meaning “stealthily”, although the primary meaning is “snapping, a quick sound”] the snapping of the fingers, the bringing together of the finger-tips: I. (lit.) *accharan* (sic) *paharati* to snap the fingers J II 447; III 191; IV 124; 126; V 314; VI 366; DhA I 38, 424; — as measure, as much as one may hold with the finger-tips, a pinch J V 385; DhA II 273 (°-gahaṇamattam); cp *ekaccharamatta* DhA II 274; — 2. (fig.) a finger's snap, ie a short moment, in *ekaccharakkhaṇe* in one moment Miln 102, and in def. of *acchariya* (qv) at DA I 43; VvA 329.

I tend to think the etymological section - in square brackets - too long and not ultimately helpful. *akṣara* / *akkhara* seems ruled out on grounds of meaning (if you looked up *akkhara* as advised, you would find ‘constant, durable, lasting’). *akkhaṇa* is mentioned apparently *only* on grounds of meaning, that it suggests quickness, as sv *akkhaṇavedhin* it is glossed as ‘lightning’. The Divyāvadāna reference seems to me to have nothing to do with *akkhaṇavedhin*: someone is woken *acchaṭāśabdena*. Of course I can be smug here; I have the advantage of Edgerton's dictionary article on *acchaṭā*. The definitions are fine, although more information could have been given, as you will see. Two of the references under meaning 1.

are incorrect. And the commentators' use in their definition of *acchariya* belongs under meaning 1., not 2.; the Vv-a passage is wrongly translated sv *acchariya*.

CPD: **accharā**, f. (comp. also *acchara*;-; *Amg* *accharā*; *acchaṭā* Vyu 138,42; *etymol. unknown*; TrPM 76 compared sa. *ācchurita*, n. = *nakhavādyā*, noting v.l. *acchurā*- Thī 67; the *Atthakathā* derived *acchariya* from this, see *accharāyogga*); 1. a snapping of the fingers (like to sa. *pucchaṭi*, *mukutī*, *mucutī*), Abh 66; in the phrase *~am paharati*, (a) as signal of command: Ja IV 336,3 (to a peacock); IV 438,5 (to dogs); Ps III 153,6 (to a horse); — (b) expressive of reprimand: Ja II 447,28; IV 124,20; DhP-a I 38,4; III 8,22; 414,6; — (c) do. of dismissal or refuse [sic]: Ja III 191,21; V 314,14; VI 542,7; DhP-a I 424,2; — (d) do. of disregard or contempt: Ps II 524,5; — (e) do. of satisfaction or joy: Ja VI 336,25; — 2. the two or three fingers by which a pinch is taken, *~āya gaṇhitvā* (*gahetvā*), DhP-a III 19,10-14 (cf. *ib.* 18,9: *tīhi aṅgulīhi gahetvā*). Cf. *accharā-gahaṇa*. — 3. a pinch, *~am sakkharāya* (of sugar), Ja V 385,19. — Ifc. v. *ekacchara-kkhaṇa*, *ekacchara-matta*.

The etymology section is more concise, and more sensible. As to the definitions, I'm surprised at the placing of the Abh reference, which is clearly concerned with measures of time, not made clear here. Also the Sanskrit words do not add anything for me; they are all given as lexical in Monier-Williams, so I do not know if or how they are used. So, are they ‘like to’ *accharā* ? My next point is a matter of taste, perhaps. The indication here of the context of the snapping of fingers is welcome, and was missing from PED (even if you looked up all its references, you

would not find the full range of uses). But I would prefer to illustrate the contexts by quotation, as I do in my dictionary article, and as later parts of CPD do. I will talk about the articles in New PED in greater detail in a few minutes, but first a few words about the dictionary in general.

It would be silly and dishonest to deny any debt to PED. It is of course the basis for my dictionary, a very important source, a *kośa* of scholarship. But I hope what we will produce will be a considerable improvement. I want the New Pali-English Dictionary to be a useful aid, and, as they say, user-friendly. I will tell you how I think it ought to be.

One aspect of the dictionary remains the same: it is to be compiled mainly on the basis of the texts issued by the Pali Text Society. If you compare the list of books consulted at the beginning of PED with a current PTS List of Issues you will see that we now have much more material. There is available to me all of the Canon and its primary commentaries. To that I add a number of later texts like the Mahāvamsa which have been published by the Pali Text Society; and, unlike PED, the Abhidhānappadīpikā, the lists of verbal roots, the Dhātupāṭha and Dhātumañjusā, and Aggavaṃsa's grammatical work, the Saddanīti. I am able to consult some of the ṭīkāś, the sub-commentaries, in a Burmese edition (only the ṭīkā to Sumaṅgalavilāsini has been published by the PTS), but I do not think the dictionary has to cover these texts. Exhaustiveness I leave to CPD. Up until recently I found occurrences of words by means of PED and Childers, the Concordance, and the indexes to whatever is indexed. Now I have also a CD-Rom of the Thai edition of the Canon and commentaries. I haven't yet used this, as I need a new computer for it, but it may make the gathering of material easier and more efficient — I hope.

When I began work, in October 1984, I was presented with twenty-six wooden boxes, about eight inches wide by fifteen long, filled

with cards on which had been pasted all the individual entries from PED. (The work of cutting and sticking which must have been involved makes me feel faint.) And I started by checking the references on each card, correcting them if necessary, adding any other pertinent references, and generally tidying up the article. Within a very short time, I realised this would not do. As Monier-Williams said:

In real truth I am bound to confess that I entered upon my ... lexicographical career with a little too magnificent audacity, and a little too airy hopefulness ...

I remind you also of Stede's words:

... it was not merely and not principally a rearrangement and editing of ready material: it was creative and re-creative work from beginning to end ...

It became necessary to use PED merely as one of a number of sources, and to create an entirely new article. In the best of conditions such work takes time. And it is made more time-consuming by the unreliability of the material. I have spoken already of the deficiencies of PED; the deficiencies of some of the editions came as a considerable shock. For several texts I must automatically check every passage in the oriental editions. Not all mistakes can be specifically corrected in the Dictionary — we would require at least another volume — but I hope some obscurities will be removed, some ghostwords laid to rest.

A dictionary article must, as I think, contain a great deal of information expressed as succinctly but as clearly as possible. It has two strands to it: the information I am giving about the word, and my

evidence or justification for that information. The article is made up like this:

1. The form of the word: the stem for a noun or adjective; the full form for an indeclinable; the third person singular (if the present is attested) for a verb; if we have no present, then the form we have.

2. An indication of what sort of word it is: verb, noun, adjective, etc, which also gives the gender. For example, if we look at some dictionary articles:

kasambu, *m.* (?) [*cf* BHS *kaśambakajāta*], *decomposed or rotten matter; refuse*; Abh 224; A IV 172,7 (*kāraṇḍavaṃ niddhamatha ~uṃ apakassatha*) = Sn 281 (Pj II 311,24 *fol.*: *kaṣaṭabhūtaṃ ca naṃ khattiyādinaṃ majjhe pavitthaṃ pabhinnaṃ paggharita-kutthaṃ caṇḍālaṃ viya apakassatha*); — *ifc* see *anto*; — °-**jāta**, *mfn.*, *decomposed; rotten*; Vin II 236,28 (*taṃ puggalaṃ dussilaṃ ... antopūtiṃ avassutaṃ ~aṃ, Be, Ce so; Ee kasambukajātaṃ; Sp 1287,7: ~an ti ākinṇadosatāya saṅkiliṭṭhajātaṃ*) = Ud 52,16 (Ud-a 297,24: *saṅjātarāgādikacavarattā sīlavantehi chaḍḍetabbattā ca ~aṃ*) ≠ S IV 181,1 (~o); A IV 171,9 (*rukkhāni antopūṭini avassutāni ~āni*); Vism 57,12* (~o *avassuto pāpo*); Nidd-a I 338,14 (~o *ti saṅkārasabhāvo*).

kasambuka, *m.* (or *mfn.*) [*kasambu* + *ka*²], *rotten matter (or: rotten)*; — °-**jāta**, *mfn.*, *decomposed; rotten*; Vin II 236,28 (*antopūtiṃ avassutaṃ ~aṃ, Ee so; Be, Ce kasambujātaṃ*) ≠ 239,8 (~o, *Ee so; Be, Ce kasambujāto*).

kasā, *f.* [*S. kaśā, kaṣā*], *a whip*; Abh 370; Vin III 47,6 (~āya *vā vettena vā ... haneyyūṃ*); M I 87,9 (*vividhā kammakāraṇā kārenti ~āhi pi tālenti*); Dh 143 (*so nindaṃ apabodhati asso bhadro ~ām iva*); Th 878 (*aṅkusehi ~āhi ca*); Sp 998,28 (*yo ... ~āhi haññati ayaṃ kasāhato*); Mhv 38:82 (*tālesi ~āy' ūrūsu so pi taṃ*); — *ifc* see *kaṇṭaka*; — °**ābhighāta**, *m.*, *striking with a whip, whipping*; Ud-a 185,7; ...

kasāva (and *kasāya*), *m.n. and mfn.* [*S. BHS kaṣāya; Amg kaṣāya*], ...

akkhāti and *akkhāyati*¹, *pr. 3 sg.* [*S. ākhyāti*], *declares, announces; tells, tells about; teaches*; Vin II 202,5* (*asandiddho ca ~āti*);

Thus '**kasambu**, *m.* (?)' tells you *kasambu* is a noun, and is probably masculine, although I can't prove it. '**kasā**, *f.*' is a noun and feminine (and I can prove it, see citations). '**kasāva** (and *kasāya*), *m.n. and mfn.*' tells you this word appears to have two forms, but *kasāva* is the more usual. It functions as a noun, when it can be masculine or neuter, and also as an adjective. A designation *m(fn)* would mean that the word is in form adjectival, but is found only in the masculine, probably functioning as a noun. '**akkhāti** and *akkhāyati*¹, *pr. 3 sg.*' tells you this is the third person singular of a verb, appearing in two forms, and that *akkhāyati* is a homonym in Pali, being the form also of the third singular of the passive. There follows

3. in square brackets, some explanation of the form of the word, that is, an attempt to place it in a linguistic context. Compared with PED, my statements are very brief, usually merely the parallel word in Sanskrit and/or Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit or another Prakrit. If you can remember the article on *accharā* I quoted from PED, you might compare it with mine:

NPED: **accharā**¹, *f.* [cf *AMg* accharā, *BHS* acchaṭā; *Trenckner* (Notes 76) connects with ācchurita], ...

If there is an equivalent form in Sanskrit, I go no further. Here perhaps by implication I am didactic or demanding. While anyone who wishes simply to read a Buddhist text can go straight to the definition, those who have more interest in Pali itself, or who wish to contribute to a discussion on meaning, should, in my opinion, know Sanskrit, and the Sanskrit parallel should either tell them what they want to know, or send them off to further research in Monier-Williams etc. When an equivalent form or sense is missing in Sanskrit, it may be supplied by Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit or, say, by ĀrdhaMāgadhī. If I've found no parallel, then I would hope to give its relation to another word in the Dictionary, which has parallels, or even, as a last resort, suggest an etymology. So, referring to the articles above, for *kasā* we have the Sanskrit *kaśā*, *kaṣā*, straightforward. *kasambu* is more difficult, although there is BHS *kaśambakajāta*. 'cf' merely warns you that the word is not absolutely parallel: I would expect anyone really interested to consult Edgerton. *kasambuka* is obviously secondary (and is a reading found only in the PTS edition); *kasambu* in square brackets should send you back to the article on *kasambu*. For *kasāva* I've written [*S.*, *BHS* kaṣāya; *AMg* kasāya]; this suggests that although the form *kaṣāya* is found in Sanskrit, a meaning closer to the Pali is found in BHS, and that the usual Prakrit form has -āya, *kasāva* being a specifically Pali development.

The information in square brackets is my first evidence for the meaning of the word.

4. If the declension of the word is irregular, I give the irregular forms. If it is a pronoun, I give the whole declension.

5. Next comes the definition. It may be superfluous to say so, but the definition is the most important, most demanding, and most personal part of the lexicographer's work. Of course some words are straightforward: I did not spend hours puzzling out the best English equivalent for *udaka*. I thought of 'water' quite quickly. But even Dr. Johnson speaks of

the labour of interpreting these words and phrases with brevity, fulness and perspicacity; a task of which the extent and intricacy is sufficiently shewn by the miscarriage of those who have generally attempted it.

And I quote Stede for Pali:

It needs careful and often intricate study to accomplish this task, for even the most skilled and well-read translators have either shirked the most difficult words, or translated them wrongly or with a term which does not and cannot cover the idea adequately. Thus many a crux retarded the work, not to speak of thousands of incorrectnesses in the text of the printed editions.

I hate to criticise a fellow lexicographer, but that 'incorrectnesses' — a word which is indeed in the Complete Oxford English Dictionary, but is rather recherché — sets me on one of my hobby-horses, even at the risk of offence. I believe dictionaries, like translations, should be written in their final form by those to whom the second language, the language translated into, is native. And that only as a very, very last resort (one so far distant that I've not yet come to it) should an English word be manufactured, or a word be chosen because etymologically it bears some relationship to the Pali, when its current connotation, or its definition in an English dictionary, is different.

The definition should be as short and all-embracing as possible. A dictionary definition does not have to contain every feasible English translation — it is not the last word. It is a starting-point for understanding a sentence, a passage, a system of thought. Finding the absolutely right English word in a particular context is the job of the reader or translator. After the definition,

6. the citations, quotations, to justify what I have already said. The choice of quotation is the second most personal part of the work, and the most interesting. I have decided almost always actually to quote passages, not merely cite them, as a bare reference tells you very little. There will be more Pali in my dictionary than in PED or the earlier parts of CPD. For example, to return to *accharā*, where CPD describes the usage, I illustrate with quotations, to show just when people snapped their fingers:

1. *snapping of the fingers* (~aṃ paharati, as a gesture of command; of annoyance, refusal, contempt; also as a gesture of pleasure); Ja II 447,28 (bodhisatto ~aṃ paharitvā); IV 124,20 (rājā ~aṃ paharitvā nassa vasali ... ti tājjesi); Sv 43,16 (°-yoggan ti acchariyaṃ, ~aṃ paharituṃ yuttan ti attho); Ps II 389,17 (kiṃ tvam etthā ti ~aṃ pahari, so thātuṃ asakkonto tatth'eva antaradhāyi); III 161,8 (daharo ... ~aṃ pahari, asso āgantvā ... bhattaṃ bhuñji); Spk I 293,32 (ekā pi gāyi ekā pi nacci ekā pi ~aṃ pahari); Cp-a 213,1 (tvam ito aññattha yāhi ti tassa ~aṃ pahari).

This may reflect my greater liking for language and literature than for words; it also reflects my liking for the great English dictionaries of Johnson and Murray, which are treasure-stores of notable writing in English, teaching meaning by usage and context. I hope my selection

serves several purposes. The passages should confirm or support the definition; in the case of doubtful or unusual words, I would quote a commentary, which may be right and which may be wrong, as Stede says. The passages should show the full spectrum of the senses of the word. They should show the range of texts in which the word is found. Some words occur only in verse texts, some only in the philosophical texts. If the word is found throughout the Canon, I would try to quote from each of several categories of text, such as the Vinaya, the verse texts, the Jātakas, the chronicles, although I would not necessarily quote a common word from the commentaries also. The information is rather negative than positive: for example, if I give no Vinaya reference for a particular word, it means I have not found that word in the Vinaya. The quotations should exemplify various grammatical forms: for example I might try to show two forms of the locative singular, if appropriate. For verbs, I aim to give an example of each tense, especially forms of the aorist, which cannot always be predicted. Thus sv *akkhāti* I list futures and various aorists, as well as the absolutive, passive, past participle and future passive participle. And finally I hope to show by my quotations the usual context of the word, what other ideas it is associated with. Notice sv *kasambu* the several occurrences of *avassuta*. The difficulty in the choosing of quotations is to leave some of them out: there are so many really interesting or quintessential or illuminating sentences in Pali. And as Dr. Johnson in a similar dilemma said, “Some passages I have yet spared, which may relieve the labour of verbal searches, and intersperse with verdure and flowers the dusty deserts of barren philology”. For example, sv *akkhāna* we don't need Buddhaghosa's explanation, but it's nice: *akkhānan ti Bhārata-Rāmāyaṇādi* (so in the PTS edition; the Burmese edition has *Bhāratayujjanādikaṃ*). The article continues with

7. compounds. First in the article there is reference to compounds of which the head-word is the second or final member, and

then a listing of compounds in which the head-word is the first member. As a general rule, only those compounds appear in the dictionary whose meaning is not easily predictable, or one of whose members is not attested as a separate word. This general rule can and must be broken on occasions, otherwise a false view of the language would result. For example, look again at *kasambu*. The compound *kasambujāta* is not difficult to work out; both members appear in the dictionary as separate words, but not to list *kasambujāta* and its occurrences would make *kasambu* seem a much more uncommon word than it is. The article might then end with a reference to another article, eg *akkhāti* refers you also to *ākhyāti*.

What more to say ? When will it be finished ?

It has been said that the experience of all lexicographers, including Johnson, is that to be certain of a date by which his dictionary will be fairly begun or ended has been the lie in the soul.

The OED was originally planned for ten years but actually took nearly fifty; nor does this include the twenty years before, during which the millions of citations forming the basis of the work were collected.

I will not answer my question. I simply call to witness Monier-Williams, moaner extraordinaire, to attest what a terribly difficult and lonely job it is writing a dictionary:

No-one but those who have taken part in similar labours can at all realize the amount of tedious toil — I might almost say dreary drudgery — involved in the daily routine of small lexicographical details, such as

verifying references and meanings, making indices and lists of words, sorting and sifting an ever-increasing store of materials, revising old work, arranging and re-arranging new, writing and rewriting and interlineating copy, correcting and recorrecting proofs — printed, be it remembered, in five kinds of intricate type, bristling with countless accents and diacritical points, and putting the eyesight, patience and temper ... to severe trial.

But let Dr. Johnson speak for me one last time:

These complaints of difficulty will, by those that have never considered words ... be thought only the jargon of a man willing to magnify his labours ... but every art is obscure to those that have not learned it ... of all the candidates for literary praise, the unhappy lexicographer holds the lowest place ... It appeared that the province allotted me was of all the regions of learning generally confessed to be the least delightful, that it was believed to produce neither fruits nor flowers, and that after a long and laborious cultivation, not even the barren laurel had been found on it. Yet on this province ... I enter'd with the pleasing hope, that as it was low, it likewise would be safe. I was drawn forward with the prospect of employment, which, tho' not splendid, could be useful, and which tho' it could not make my life envied, would keep it innocent, which could awaken no passion, engage me in no contention, nor throw in my way any temptation to disturb the quiet of others by censure, or my own by flattery ... and whatever be the event of my

endeavours, I shall not easily regret an attempt which has procured me the honour of appearing thus publicly ... [the Pali Text Society's] most obedient and most humble servant.

Cambridge

Margaret Cone

Chips from Buddhist Workshops Scribes and Manuscripts from Northern Thailand¹

At the 4th International Conference on Thai Studies in Kunming in 1990 some colophons of old Lān²-nā Pāli manuscripts were discussed in a rather general and preliminary way². This survey can and will be supplemented now by more detailed and new information gathered in the meantime first of all while working on a catalogue of the collection of Pāli manuscripts kept at Vat Lai Hin near Lampang. This collection is among the most remarkable ones by any standard anywhere in respect of both age and quality of the manuscripts, the oldest dated of which was copied in CS 833 : A.D. 1471. Today about 140 Pāli manuscripts are found in this collection, and quite a few fragments or single folios are sad witnesses of the former existence of many, sometimes fairly old, manuscripts, for originally this collection must have been substantially larger and richer. This is not only proved by these fragments, but also by those manuscripts which have found their way from Vat Lai Hin into other libraries under unknown circumstances. Some are with the Siam Society, Bangkok³, and at least one is today in the National Library, Bangkok: no. 303/5, *tū*² 129, *ja* 82/5: Samantapāsādikā, fasc. 5, which is one of the missing fascicles of Siam Society no. 54, as proved by identical measures and identical colophons. Otherwise the holdings of older northern Pāli manuscripts in the National Library are negligible as

¹ Manuscripts are quoted either in referring to the forthcoming catalogue: *Die Pāli Handschriften des Klosters Lai Hin bei Lampang/Thailand* or to the microfilms of the "Preservation of Northern Thai Manuscripts Project" (PNTMP). – The letter *ø* is used for the "*o aṅg*".

² O. v.Hinüber: On some colophons of old Lānnā Pāli manuscripts, in: *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Thai Studies*. 11-13th May 1990. Kunming 1990, Vol. IV, p.56-77.

³ Cf. O. v.Hinüber: The Pāli manuscripts kept at the Siam Society, Bangkok. A Short Catalogue. JSS 75.1987, p.9-74.